

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are all the claims now pending in the application. Claims 21-23 have been added as new claims.

I. IDS

In the office action of February 25, 2003, the Examiner signed the PTO-1449 form, but did not initial the references. Applicant requests a correct initialed form from the Examiner in the next Office Action.

II. Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that claim 19 contains allowable subject matter but stands objected to for being dependent upon a rejected independent claim. Applicant has rewritten claim 19 in independent form including all limitations of the vase claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 19 is in allowable form and respectfully requests that the objection to claim 19 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

III. Claim Rejections

Claims 1-18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,782,033) in view of Kaneko (U.S. Patent No. 5,236,147).

Applicant traverses the rejection for at least the reasons discussed below.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness the Examiner must show that the prior art references, when combined, teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. See MPEP § 2143.

Applicant respectfully submits that the references cited above by the Examiner fail to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations as set forth in the present application.

The cited references fail to teach or suggest a fishing reel “wherein said fishing information includes fishfinder information transmitted from an exterior fishfinder through said receiver and said transmitter; wherein said information device includes a display which simultaneously displays said fishfinder information and the measured line length.”

Both Park and Kaneko fail to teach these limitations. Park does not teach or suggest transmitting, receiving or displaying to the angler “fishfinder information.” Park teaches a submersible unit 10 attached to an electronic unit 16 on a fishing rod by means of a cable 14. The submersible unit 10 gathers aquatic/environmental information, which is transmitted via the cable 14 to the electronic unit 16, when a strike occurs. The submersible unit 10 of Park transmits various aquatic conditions, GPS , and tension on the fishing line. Park does not discuss detecting or finding fish. Therefore, Park does not teach or suggest transmitting “fishfinder information.”

Kanek fails to cure the deficient teachings of Park. Kanek only teaches a device for measuring the wound or unwound amount of fishing line of the reel based on the number of spool rotations. Kanek does not teach or suggest transmitting or receiving “fishfinder information.”

In light of the above remarks, Applicant submits that the cited references fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
Appln. No.: 09/961,206


Attorney Docket No.: Q66362

requests that the rejection of claims 1-18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


Michael J. Whitehead
Registration No. 48,071

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 18, 2003